

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHARLES WRIGHT,

Plaintiff,

No. C 13-03487 WHA

v.

CHARLES PATTERSON, et al.,

ORDER DISMISSING ACTION

Defendants.

/

In this property damage action involving a United States Postal Service vehicle, defendants moved to dismiss on August 5. Upon reassignment to the undersigned judge, the hearing on the motion was re-noticed for November 7. As stated in the order reassigning the action, however, the “[b]riefing schedules remain unchanged” (Dkt. No. 10). *Pro se* plaintiff Charles Wright failed to file an opposition or statement of non-opposition by the August 19 deadline. A subsequent order to show cause (Dkt. No. 14) ordered plaintiff to show cause by October 15 why the motion to dismiss should not be granted. Mr. Wright failed to respond to the show cause order. This order finds that Mr. Wright has failed to prosecute this action. Defendants’ motion to dismiss is accordingly **GRANTED**. Judgment will be entered in a separate order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 22, 2013.


WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

United States District Court

For the Northern District of California

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28